

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of the application, in view of the above amendments and the following remarks, is respectfully requested.

The Examiner objects to Claim 17 under 37 C.F.R. 1.75(a) because although this claim meets the requirement of 37 C.F.R. 112, second paragraph, the feature "LEDs" should be changed to -- light emitting diodes (LEDs) --, so as to define the feature consistently with the disclosure, at least once. Claim 17 has been amended in this respect.

The Examiner rejects claims 12, 13, 23 and 27 under 37 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by SHIGEO (JP 11-161219) cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 13, 2003. The Examiner specifically refers to FIG. 8 and Page 4 of the translation, Paragraph 0026. Paragraph 0026 mentions that the invention of the reference can be used with LEDs as well as electroluminescence devices.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The operation of the circuit of FIG. 8 is described in Paragraph 0025 of the translation. The translation recites on lines 3-5 of Paragraph 0025: "For example, like drawing 8, the cathode of the light emitting device can be connected to a data line 11, and anode plate can be connected to the scan line 12, ..." In sharp contrast, in the present invention, the LEDs are connected to the scan line and to the source V_{bb} while at the same time the scan line is coupled to the reference potential via the switch 22. This is clearly illustrated in FIG. 3 of the present invention in which the signal SK has risen to a high value in order to close the switch K_i at a time when the signal SG is driven to a high value during time T_g to drive the discharge switch SG (element 22), for example. It should be noted that at this time, the signals SF_0 , SF_1 , SF_2 , and SF_3 are all at their low values indicating that the switches SF_i are disconnected. Therefore, where the reference states that the cathodes of the LEDs are connected to the data line, the present invention has them disconnected from the data line. Claims 12 and 17 have been amended in this respect.

The Examiner rejects Claims 14-19, 21, 22, and 24-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shigeo. These claims are dependent directly or indirectly from Claims 12 and 17. The patentability of Claims 12 and 17 having been shown above, these claims are patentable for the same reasons.

Accordingly, Applicants believe the Application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

By 
William B. Kempner
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
Tel.: (972) 917-5452